



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,816	07/28/2003	Chang Nam Kim	CIT-0139A	4351
7590 08/13/2004				
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. Box 221200 Chantilly, VA 20153-1200		EXAMINER ZIMMERMAN, GLENN		
		ART UNIT 2879		PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/627,816

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Glenn Zimmerman

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 12-14 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0703</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of what is believe to be a spelling error. On line 7 of the abstract, the examiner suggests changing "organic" to - - inorganic - -. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Election/Restrictions

Examiner acknowledges applicant's response regarding election.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2879

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16-18 are rejected because they depend from a canceled base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nilsson et al.
U.S. Patent 6,635,989.

Regarding claim 10, Nilsson discloses in a method for sealing (**abstract**) an organic EL display panel having a multi-layered structure (**ref. 12, 14 and 16**) in which a first electrode (**anode ref. 16**) and a second electrode (**cathode metal ref. 12**) are formed on a transparent panel (**glass substrate ref. 18**) and at least one organic EL layer (**polymeric material ref. 14**) is formed between them, the method for sealing an

organic EL display panel comprising the steps of: forming a buffer layer (**ceramic thin film ref. 68; col. 5 lines 54-55**) on the transparent panel; and locating a shield cover on the buffer layer (**col. 5 lines 59 and 60**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers U.S. Patent 6,081,071 in view of Onitsuka et al. U.S. Patent 6,049,167.

Regarding claim 10, Rogers teaches a method for sealing (**abstract**) an organic EL display panel (**ref. 13 organic EL device having display area; col. 2 line 66; col. 2 lines 6-9**) having a multi-layered structure (**col. 1 lines 21-25**) in which a first electrode (**lamine pair of electrodes**) and a second electrode (**lamine pair of electrodes**) are formed on a transparent panel (**ref. 12 glass substrate**) and at least one organic EL layer (**col. 2 line 46; col 1 lines 21-25**) is formed between them, the method for sealing an organic EL display panel, but fails to teach comprising the steps of: forming a buffer layer on the transparent panel; and locating a shield cover on the buffer layer. Onitsuka et al. in the analogous art teaches comprising the steps of: forming a buffer layer on the transparent panel; and locating a shield cover on the buffer

layer (**col. 4 lines 10-15 adhesive applied to substrate first**). Additionally, Onitsuka teaches incorporation of such a method of applying to improve joining together or assembly of a substrate to a shield member (**col. 4 lines 8-15**) and also the adhesive can function as a spacer (**col. 6 lines 24-27**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the steps of: forming a buffer layer on the transparent panel; and locating a shield cover on the buffer layer in the method for sealing of Rogers, since such a modification would improve joining together or assembly of a substrate to a shield member and also the adhesive can function as a spacer as taught by Onitsuka et al.

Regarding claim 12, Rogers discloses the method of claim 10 wherein the buffer layer is formed only on the panel of a region where the shield cover is located. Figure 3 and Figures 1 and 2 show these limitations.

Regarding claim 14, Rogers discloses the method of claim 14 wherein the buffer layer of the region where the shield cover is located has an uneven shape (**patterned adhesive col. 3 line 13**) or a dot shape.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rogers U.S. Patent 6,081,071 in view of Onitsuka et al. U.S. Patent 6,049,167 and Fleming et al. U.S. Patent 6,111,357.

Regarding claim 13, Rogers teaches all the limitations of claim 13, but fails to teach wherein the buffer layer is formed on the electrode of a region where the shield cover is located. Fleming et al. in the analogous art teaches wherein the buffer layer

(**Fig. 4 ref. 84 perimeter seal**) is formed on the electrode (**metallized leader ref. 20**) of a region where the shield cover is located (**ref. 70 protective cover**). Additionally, Fleming teaches incorporation of such a buffer layer formed on the electrode of a region where the shield cover is located to improve the display by allowing power/electricity into the organic electroluminescent display to power the display (**col. 7 lines 1-12**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use wherein the buffer layer is formed on the electrode of a region where the shield cover is located in the display of Rogers, since such a modification would improve the display by allowing power/electricity into the organic electroluminescent display to power the display as taught by Fleming et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 11, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a method including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 11, and specifically wherein the buffer layer is formed on an entire surface of the panel other than a tap bonding region and a pixel region of the first and second electrodes could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Regarding claim 15, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a method including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 15, and specifically wherein the dot shaped buffer layer is formed of any one of a round shape, a triangle shape, a quadrangle shape, and a polygonal shape could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hidler et al. U.S. Patent 4,599,538 discloses an Electroluminescent Display Device. This particular reference uses a silicon nitride layer reference 60.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Zimmerman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh D Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2879

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Glenn Zimmerman



Vip Patel
Primary Examiner
AU 2879